

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11-13 and 38-46 are all the claims pending in the application. Claim 37 is canceled.

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11-13, 38-41 and 43-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Polizzi et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0023158; hereinafter “Polizzi”) in view of Albert et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,970,913; hereinafter “Albert”) in further view of DeBettencourt et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,279,001; hereinafter “DeBettencourt”).

Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Polizzi in view of Albert in view of DeBettencourt in further view of Phaal (U.S. Patent No. 6,138,159; hereinafter “Phaal”).

Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Polizzi in view of Albert in view of DeBettencourt in further view of Yousefi’zadeh (U.S. Patent No. 6,950,848; hereinafter “Yousefi”).

Analysis Claim Rejections

Claim 1 is amended to include the subject matter of claim 37, and to more clearly recite the claimed invention. Claim 37 is subsequently canceled. Specifically, claim 1 as amended recites a method for identifying a status corresponding to interactions between a remote application and a data source, the method comprising, *inter alia*:

providing at least one interface module to interface with a remote application;

providing at least one port module to interface between the interface module and the data source;
providing a connection manager to facilitate the interface between the interface module and the port module,
wherein the connection manager receives a request for the data source from the interface module, and transmits an identifier of an available port module to the interface module,
wherein the interface module connects directly with the port module based on the identifier transmitted by the connection manager, and
wherein subsequent communication from the interface module to the port module after the interface module connects directly with the port module, is independent of the connection manager.

According to the claimed invention, the interface module provides to the connection manager a request for the data source. The connection manager transmits to the interface module an identifier of an available port module. The interface module connects directly to the port module based on the identifier, and subsequent communication from the interface module to the port module after the interface module connects directly with the port module, is independent of the connection manager.

Referring to Fig. 1 of Polizzi, the Examiner alleges that the network interface/server 105 corresponds to the claimed interface module, the service broker 125 corresponds to the claimed connection manager, the agents 130 correspond to the claimed at least one port module, and the databases 135, 140, 145 and 150 correspond to the claimed data source.

The Examiner acknowledges that Polizzi fails to teach or suggest the claimed feature of “wherein the interface module connects directly with the port module based on the identifier transmitted by the connection manager”. Instead, the Examiner relies on Albert to address this deficiency of Polizzi. Albert discloses a method that includes “receiving at a service manager a

connection request intercepted by a network device having a forwarding agent..., the connection request having been forwarded from the forwarding agent on the network device to the service manager” (col. 4, lines 28-33). The service manager then selects a preferred server to service the connection request, and provides instructions to the forwarding agent specifying “the preferred server that is to service the connection request” (col. 4, lines 33-40). Albert also discloses the service manager providing specific instructions to the forwarding agent detailing where packets for each load balanced flow are to be forwarded, and also general instructions specifying which new flows the service manager is interested in seeing (col. 8, lines 27-34). The Examiner alleges that the combination of Polizzi and Albert would “enable direct communications between Polizzi’s network interface and agents independent of the service broker” (Final Office Action dated October 24, 2008, page 5).

Claim 1 further recites that once the interface module connects directly with the port module, “wherein subsequent communication *from* the interface module to the port module after the interface module connects directly with the port module, is independent of the connection manager” (emphasis added). The Examiner acknowledges that neither Polizzi nor Albert teach or suggest at least this claimed feature. Instead, the Examiner relies in Phaal to address this deficiency of Polizzi and Albert. However, regardless of whether Phaal discloses this claimed feature, Applicant respectfully submits that such a combination of Polizzi, Albert and Phaal would cause the system of Polizzi to not work as intended.

For example, with respect to the service agents 130, Polizzi discloses “a plurality of service agents 130 that are configured to perform *specific* tasks within the portal system 120”

(paragraph 21). That is, according to Polizzi, a multitude of service agents 130 are required for the completion of any *one* job. Specifically, the event server service agent 215 schedules a job for processing, the authentication server service agent 220 determines if the user should have access to the portal system 120, the name server service agent 225 stores information on all the other service agents, etc. (paragraph 24).

The system of Polizzi is directed toward the portal system 120 receiving a request for a job from a user 100 (paragraph 22). The users are connected to the network interface/server 105, and a web client 115 resident on the network interface/server 105 communicates the request to the portal system 120 (paragraph 23). If, as the Examiner alleges, the network interface/server 105 communicates directly with a service agent, then the network interface/server 105 would have to communicate any new requests for jobs directly to the service agent. However, as noted above, according to Polizzi a single service agent is not sufficient for the completion of any one job. For example, if the network interface/server 105 were to communicate directly with the authentication server, the network interface/server 105 may be able to authenticate a user, but would not be able to schedule or execute the job. Similarly, if the network interface/server 105 were to communicate directly with the event server 215, the network interface/server may be able to schedule the job, but would not be able to authenticate the user or execute the job.

For this reason, Polizzi discloses providing the service broker and receiving all requests for jobs at the service broker. According to Polizzi, the service broker 125 serves two functions in the portal system (paragraph 24). First, the service broker 125 “controls access to the portal system 120 by users 100” and second, the service broker 125 “controls the disposition of jobs to

the service agents within the portal system”. Polizzi further emphasizes that “[by] controlling the disposition of jobs, the service broker 125 ensures that jobs are processed in an orderly manner and that none of the service agents become overloaded” (paragraph 24). Controlling the disposition of the jobs to the service agents, and ensuring that the service agents do not become overloaded aids the successful completion of user requested jobs. Clearly, modifying Polizzi by bypassing the service broker to enable direct communication from the network interface/server to the service agents, as the Examiner alleges, would cause the system to not work as intended. Such a modified system would not permit the successful completion of jobs requested by a user.

Furthermore, assuming, *arguendo*, that the network interface/server 105 were to directly communicate with each of the multitude of service agents, then the second function of the service broker 125 is frustrated. Providing the network interface/server 105 direct access to each of the service agents would 1) prevent the service broker from controlling the disposition of jobs, and 2) the jobs may not be processed in an orderly manner thereby overloading the service agents. As noted above, Polizzi explicitly provides the service broker 125, to handle the orderly disposition of jobs to the service agents to ensure none of the service agents are overloaded. That is, the service broker 125 directs each of the service agents to perform their intended function for each job the service broker 125 is handling.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over the applied references. Applicant further submits that claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11-13 and 38-46 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. Appln. No.: 09/750,432

Attorney Docket No.: A8645
IBM Ref.: STL919990134US2

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Rohit K. Krishna /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/142133

46159

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 26, 2009

Rohit K. Krishna
Registration No. 62,474